

REMARKS

Prior to this Amendment and Response, claims 1 and 3-7 were pending in the Application (claim 2 having previously been cancelled). Herein, claims 1 and 5-7 are amended. Entry of this Amendment, reconsideration, and allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

In paragraphs 2 and 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. §112, stating that they failed to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention because they each refer to “claims 1 to 4. In response, Applicants have amended claims 5-7 to place claims 5, 6, and 7 in independent form. Dependent claims 3 and 4 are directly dependent upon claim 1 and are believed to be in proper form without further amendment.

In light of the amendments described above, Applicants believe that this ground for rejection has been overcome.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

In paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 3-7 under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by *Wiberg et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,628,946). In response, Applicants have amended the claims in a manner believed to better distinguish the present invention over the cited reference.

Specifically, independent claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation that a deferred system information change timer is started prior to reading a Master Information Block. Updated system information is acquired if the Master Information Block indicates a change, otherwise it is determined if the system information change timer is still running and, if so, at least one subsequent Master Information Block is read.

This amendment is supported in the Specification at, for example, paragraph [0032] and by Figure 5B. This feature, which enables the more efficient acquisition of system information when a system information change is deferred is not taught or suggested in *Wiberg et al.* While it is noted that *Wiberg et al.* refers to sending both deferred and repeated indications of when system information will change (*see* col. 18, lines 1-22), it does not teach or suggest the solution of the utilization of a deferred system information change time as is now recited in independent claim 1. New claim 17 contains the limitation that the user equipment configures a PCH or FACH after cell reselection, which limitation was previously recited in claim 1. New claims 18-20 further define the invention recited in claim 1, and also find support in paragraph [0032] and Figure 5B. New claim 21 addresses sending notification of deferred system information changes and is supported in the Specification at paragraph [0043].

Independent claim 1, especially as presently amended, is therefore believed to be distinguishable over the cited art. Claims 5, 6, and 7 are believed to be distinguishable over the cited art for the same reasons as those given with respect to claim 1.

Appl. No. 10/754,735
Amdt. dated August 20, 2007
Reply to Office Action of April 23, 2007

Dependent claims 3 and 4; which include all of the limitations of their parent claims, are also believed to be distinguishable over the cited art for the same reasons as those given with respect to claim 1.

In light of the foregoing, the pending claims are believed to be in condition for allowance. Accordingly, examination and allowance of pending claims 1 and 3-7 is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert H. Kelly/

Robert H. Kelly
Reg. No. 33,922

SCHEEF & STONE, L.L.P.
5956 Sherry Lane, Suite 1400
Dallas, Texas 75225
Telephone: (214) 706-4201
Fax: (214) 706-4242
robert.kelly@scheefandstone.com